

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested. After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 15-62 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.<sup>1</sup>

By way of summary, the Office Action presented the following issues: Claims 15-18, 20-23, 26-29, 34-44, 46-49, and 52-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2004/0160630 to Iriyama et al. (hereinafter “Iriyama”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2003/0011633 to Conley et al. (hereinafter “Conley”); Claims 19, 24-25, 45, and 50-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Iriyama in view of Conley and U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2004/0193717 to Tajima et al. (hereinafter “Tajima”); and Claims 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Iriyama in view of Conley and U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2004/0239975 to Kawaura et al. (hereinafter “Kawaura”).

In light of the several grounds of rejection on the merits, independent Claims 15, 34, 38, 40-41, 56, 60, and 62 have been amended to clarify the claimed inventions and to thereby more clearly patentably define over applied references.

Amended Claim 15 is directed to a system including, in part, “an external processing apparatus . . . , the external processing apparatus sending a screen update instruction request to the image handling apparatus in response to a message informing an end of the image handling process . . . .” Applicants respectfully submit that no proper combination of Iriyama and Conley discloses or suggests those features.

Iriyama concerns an image printing system in which “the contents displayed on the operation unit of the digital copying machine 1 are all the data transmitted from the PC server

---

<sup>1</sup> The amendments to independent Claims 15, 34, 38, 40-41, 56, 60, and 62 find support at least in Figure 69 and in its accompanying text in the specification.

3 to the digital copying machine 1 . . .”<sup>2</sup> The Office conceded that “Iriyama does not specifically disclose the external processing apparatus sending a screen update instruction request to the image handling apparatus during the image handling process . . . .”<sup>3</sup> It is respectfully submitted that Iriyama fails to disclose or suggest the feature of “the external processing apparatus sending a screen update instruction request to the image handling apparatus in response to a message informing an end of the image handling process,” as recited in amended Claim 15.

Conley concerns a system in which “the copier begins scanning and it also updates the UI and waits for the user to make a selection of a UI control . . . .”<sup>4</sup> In the Conley system, “Upon such selection of a UI control . . . , XML data indicative thereof is communicated to the network PC . . . .”<sup>5</sup>

That is, Conley merely describes communicating XML data upon a selection of a UI control. Conley does not disclose or suggest that the XML data informs an end of the scanning. It is respectfully submitted that Conley fails to disclose or suggest the feature of “the external processing apparatus sending a screen update instruction request to the image handling apparatus in response to a message informing an end of the image handling process,” as recited in Claim 15.

Thus, Iriyama and Conley, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the feature of “the external processing apparatus sending a screen update instruction request to the image handling apparatus in response to a message informing an end of the image handling process,” as advantageously recited in Claim 15.

---

<sup>2</sup> Iriyama, para. [0082].

<sup>3</sup> Office Action at 3.

<sup>4</sup> Conley, para. [0038].

<sup>5</sup> Id.

It is therefore submitted that independent Claim 15 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over any proper combination of Iriyama and Conley for at least the foregoing reasons.

It is additionally submitted that independent Claims 34, 38, 40-41, 56, 60 and 62 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguish over any proper combination of Iriyama and Conley for at least reasons analogous to those set forth above with regard to Claim 15.

It is additionally submitted that Tajima and Kawaura fail to remedy the above-noted deficiencies in Iriyama and Conley. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of dependent Claims 19, 24-25, 30-33, 45, and 50-51 are moot.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is patentably distinguished over the applied references and is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James J. Kulbalski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian R. Epstein  
Registration No. 60,329

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/09)